

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 12 and 24 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 12 and 24 puts this application into condition for allowance and should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new issues are being raised.

Claims 12 and 24 are both amended to clarify that, respectively, a system and a device, using claim 12 as an example, include "the signal transmitted at a timing from the transmission part is provided alternatively to the wave direction parts so that the same input information is transmitted alternately through the wave direction parts." Support for the amendment is found, for example, in FIG. 8 and no new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-11, 16-23 AND 30 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HUM ET AL. (US 6,714,133)

The Examiner rejects independent claims 1, 16, and 30 (and respective dependent claims 2-11 and 17-23) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hum. The rejections are traversed.

Applicants submit that Hum does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not discussing features recited in independent claims 1, 16, and 30. As set forth in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 30 respectively recite an input system and an input device, using claim 1 as an example, including "simultaneously transmitting a first signal and a second signal generated by having a plurality of different carrier frequencies modulated with the same input information; and a reception part receiving the transmitted signals and demodulating the signals into the same input information."

The Examiner contends these features are taught by Hum citing col. 8, lines 21-24 and col. 10, lines 35-38. (Action at page 2).

Applicants submit that Hum does not teach, for example, such a "substantially simultaneously transmitting a first signal and a second signal . . . generated by having a

plurality of different carrier frequencies," in the lines cited by the Examiner or anywhere else. Rather, Hum merely teaches (see, for example, col. 5, lines 20-40):

interrogator may generate and transmit an interrogation signal that includes components intended for different transponders. . . . Each of the components of the signal is carried on all of the communication lines 14a to 14n in an arbitrary pattern and transmitted from all or an arbitrary number of the coupling coils, but is intended to communicate with only one of the transponders, say transponder 18a. . . . cause the transponder to initialize and send an identification signal or ID code and/or data back to the interrogator through the coupling port 16a and communication line 14a.

That is, Hum teaches a system in which an interrogation signal is transmitted to each of the transponders 18a through 18n in order and at a different timing, through the ports 16a through 16n. Hum further teaches (col. 8, lines 21-24) that at this point "the interrogator may generate signals of different radio frequencies," that are employed for different interrogation signals for the corresponding transponders 18a through 18n so as to "distinguish between transponders" (see for example, col. 8, lines 19-20). In addition, Hum teaches that (col. 8, lines 27-33) "interrogation signals for the different transponders are sent in sequence or in some other manner that permits them to be distinguished from one another."

That is, according to Hum, at one timing, an interrogation signal for the transponder 18a is transmitted through the ports 16a through 16n using a certain frequency, and at the next timing, an interrogation signal for the next transponder 18b is transmitted through the ports 16a through 16n using a different frequency, thereby distinguishing between transponders 18a and 18b.

Accordingly, Hum merely teaches that interrogation signals of different frequencies are transmitted at different timings and does not teach that signals are transmitted at substantially the same timing or simultaneously as according to recited aspects of the present invention.

Summary

Since features recited by independent claims 1, 16, and 30 (and respective dependent claims 2-11 and 17-23) are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-11, 16-23 and 30 allowed.

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12, 15, AND 24-27 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HUM

The Examiner rejects independent claims 12 and 24 and respective dependent claims 13-15 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hum. The rejections are traversed.

Applicants submit that Hum does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not discussing features recited in independent claims 12 and 24, both as amended.

Claims 12 and 24, as both amended, clarify that, respectively, an input system and a

device, using claim 12 as an example, include a "signal transmitted at a timing from the transmission part is provided alternately to the wave direction parts so that the same input information is transmitted alternately through the wave direction parts."

That is, according to aspects of the present invention, a signal transmitted at a timing from the transmission part is provided alternately to the wave direction parts so that the same input information is transmitted alternately through the wave direction parts. As illustrated, for example in FIG. 8, multiple signals are output from antenna (waveguide parts) 29 and 30, but at a point of generation in the transmission circuit 211, there is one signal generated in and transmitted from the transmission circuit 211.

Hum does not teach such an alternate transmission. Rather, Hum teaches (see, for example, col. 5, starting at line 20) an interrogation signal to be transmitted to one of the transponders 18a through 18n at one timing is considered to be transmitted simultaneously to the ports 16a through 16n.

Summary

Since features recited by independent claims 12 and 24, both as amended (and respective dependent claims 13-15 and 25-27) are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 12-15 and 23-27 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 1, 2006

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501